Detailed Meeting Notes
Hamilton Army Airfield Restoration Advisory Board
Novato Police Station Meeting Room
Novato, California
January 14, 2004

Attendance

RAB Members Present:

Ed Keller; Jennifer Valenzia; Naomi Feger; Jim Ponton; Patricia Eklund; Richard A. Draeger; Sue Lattanzio; Lance McMahan; Marucia Britto; Theresa McGarry; Jim McAlister; Joan Dekelboum; Eric Polson; Ross Millerick; David Doak; Preston Cook; Tunstall Lang; Jeff Johnston.

RAB Members Absent:

Ray Zimny; Rich Seraydarian, Manuel Meir; Tom Gandesbery; Matthew McCarron; Sabrina Molinari; William McNicholas.

Others Present:

Joy Lanzaro; Hugh Ashley; Samantha Calamari; Travis Williamson; Jim Davies; Sandrine Sovlet; Kari Thompson; Gina Lynch; Cara Naiditch; Lee Saunders; John Kaiser; Susan Stompe; Judy Arnold; Jennifer Gollan. Michael Wade, Patty Wong-Yim

Welcoming Remarks

Tunstall Lang welcomed the community to the January 14, 2004 meeting of the Hamilton Army Airfield Restoration Advisory Board (RAB). The meeting began at 7:20 p.m.

Navy BRAC Update — Jennifer Valenzia, DODHF Novato BEC

Project Update

Ms. Valenzia presented an update of site conditions east of C Street. There was a recent article in the Marin Independent Journal (IJ) dated January 4, 2004 regarding the migration of the MTBE Plume and its impacts on the Novato Charter School North Bay Children's Center. The article suggests that the plume migration pattern has changed and could result in unsafe condition for the school occupants. The article also states that the Navy and regulatory agencies indicated that the property is safe; however the city officials indicate otherwise. Representatives of the City have informed us that this is a misconception and that they do not believe there are unsafe conditions at the school property.

Mr. Davies (an environmental consultant representing the City of Novato, New Hamilton Partnership, Shea Homes, Novato Community Partners, and Novato Unified School District) spoke with the IJ reporter, Jennifer Gollan, at length and believed that the statements from the city officials were misleading. He did not state that there were unsafe conditions but there may have been other city officials that were unsure of the facts and

inadvertently made misleading statements. Mr. Davies is in the process of writing a response to the article on behalf of the city that should come out next Tuesday, in time for the community forum.

Mr. Cook expressed disappointment because he is not sure if the city officials or reporters are to blame for the misrepresentation of information. He feels that whoever is to blame for the misinformation should be held responsible.

Mr. Johnston indicated that positive events should also be covered.

Ms. Britto said that there is a fear instilled from articles like this, which she feels is irresponsible journalism. The schools become scared for the safety of their children, and parents are calling in.

Ms. Gollan stated that any doubt about the validity of facts should be directed to the editor. She was not prepared to talk to this issue as it was not on the agenda but will be available to take questions after the meeting. She stated that it is not the reporter's job to interpret the news, just to write it and it is her position that the story meant to represent all sides.

Ms. Lanzaro said that this reporter is new to the topic and there is a whole history of negative reporting for Hamilton that she is not responsible for.

Ms. Valenzia continued discussing the school area, which is the property west of C Street. The property has been studied since 1992 and is very well characterized. The characterization activities were conducted prior to its transfer to Novato Unified School District and those studies confirmed that the site was safe. The school property is situated above bedrock, which minimizes the eastward movement of groundwater. Soil gas measurements are collected monthly and groundwater samples are collected quarterly to ensure the property remains safe. There have been no measurements that have indicated changing groundwater movement or unsafe conditions. Procedures are in place to mitigate any possible risks, however none has been activated. All risk calculations have shown the North Bay Children's Center and the Novato Charter School are safe for children and adults.

Travis Williamson, a consultant for the Navy, presented the technical data that has been collected. The studies confirming that the school property is safe include a Tier 3 Risk-Based Corrective Action (RBCA) Assessment (November 1999); Final Remedial Investigation Report (January 2001); Additional Subsurface Characterization in Public Benefits Conveyance Parcel 2 (October 2001); Final Corrective Action Plan (March 2002); and the Final revised Risk Assessment (September 2003).

Quarterly groundwater monitoring has been conducted for 6 years. In the February and August monitoring events, 59 groundwater wells were sampled, four of which are located on the school property. Six surface water locations are sampled on a quarterly basis in addition to three new bedrock wells that were installed in November 2003. During the

May and November sampling events, 75 groundwater wells were sampled, four of which are located on the school property.

With regard to the biosparging remediation system currently in operation at the site, we conduct monthly sampling of eight groundwater monitoring wells within the treatment area to gauge how effectively we are remediating the MTBE. We also collect samples from seven soil gas monitoring probes located between the treatment system and nearby receptors including the charter school and day care center. Four of those seven soil gas monitoring probes are on the school property. We also conduct an annual sampling event of all 49 biosparging injection wells that are part of the system.

None of the samples collected indicate that the school is unsafe. The soil sampling results during additional subsurface characterization activities measured 15 micrograms per kilogram, which is a low level concentration. The regulatory threshold number for California residents is 17,000 micrograms per kilogram.

Question: So, above 17,000 mg/kg is an issue and below 17,000 mg/kg is ok?
Mr. Williamson: Basically, yes.

Question: What happens when microorganisms eat the MTBE?
Mr. Williamson: Carbon Dioxide and Water are released as a by-product of the digestion of MTBE by the bacteria.

The quarterly groundwater results show low level concentrations of MTBE pose no risk. The MTBE fluctuations can be attributed to normal seasonal variations in the water table, due to weather conditions. Groundwater is moving to the north. The soil gas data shows that there is no threat of harmful MTBE exposure. The concentrations range from very low to non-detectable and do not exceed the conservative residential exposure threshold. The biosparging system will operate for another 6-10 months, and the Navy will continue to monitor the sites to ensure that there is not a rebound in MTBE concentrations.

Mr. Millerick clarified that there are two gas stations.

Mr. Cook: Why is there such a great fluctuation in concentrations when they are close in proximity?
Mr. Williamson: We are unsure, but the concentration levels do not indicate that there is an unacceptable risk based on the NPA threshold. The plan is to pay close attention as we continue to monitor the system in order to ensure safety.

Mr. Johnston: As the plume is moving northward, does it dissipate? How long is the Navy responsible for monitoring this site?
Mr. Williamson: When I say moving north, I am talking about groundwater flow. The plume itself is not moving and I consider it stable. The Navy will be monitoring this plume for at least five years. The biosparging system will be run for the next 5 years and monitoring will continue after the system is shut down. It will then be determined on a

cooperative basis by the regulatory agencies if there is further monitoring needed. The site will be closed but not in the near future.

Mr. Ponton: The Regional Board requested the Navy to develop a Corrective Action Plan in 2002 to contain and clean-up the plume and establish the footprint of the plume. The Navy will have the responsibility to monitor the plume until it is totally clean. In the early phases of remediation, generally there is a large decrease and then the concentrations begin to flatten out.

Ms. Eklund: Will the Navy always have responsibility to clean-up the area, for example if the MTBE plume were to come back?
Mr. Ponton: Yes.
Ms. Eklund: It is important to point out that the Navy will always be liable for the site.

Mr. Cook: Has more clean-up been done on this site compared with others in other parts of the state?
Mr. Williamson: The site has been aggressively cleaned.

Mr. Kaiser: Compared to the typical MTBE release site, this is a large release. The San Francisco Bay area has approximately 10,000 known leaking underground storage tanks that contain MTBE. This is the most in the country. The Hamilton site is unusual when compared with the rest of the cases in the state. The current treatment system is diminishing the MTBE. The geology, chemistry of the soils, chemistry and depth of the groundwater, and the methodology are all unique in the Hamilton site, but the system is working. This site is very well characterized.

Mr. Williamson referred to the bedrock topography map which shows the water table elevation. It appears that the groundwater flow is actually moving away from the school property. Investigations that have been done by both the Navy and Army have detected a streambed channel that was located right through the middle of the site. This could have been the location of Pacheco Creek before the area was developed with the air field. This creek or trough is what transported the groundwater. The level of bedrock in this area is high (1-3' below ground surface), which would minimize any possibility of water flowing to the east.

He explained that the data show that the 1999 Tier 3 Risk Assessment calculated risk-based screening levels in groundwater at 135,000 parts per billion (ppb) and 184,000 ppb to be protective of adults and children. In November 2003, the highest concentration detected in the groundwater (detected north of the school property) was 20,000 ppb and the highest concentration detected on the school property was 5.4 ppb. Based on Tier 3 risk assessment, these concentrations levels indicate that there is no risk associated with the groundwater concentrations.

Mr. Johnston: How would a city official have the criteria to state (to the Marin IJ) that there is migration of MTBE from the plume?

Mr. Williamson: There are seasonal changes or there is a misunderstanding of technical data by the reporter.
Mr. Davies: The City officials did not state that there was movement eastward but instead talked about the numbers and this may have been misinterpreted.

Ms. Lanzaro: What impact does surface deposition have, such as cars driving by and dripping gasoline that contains MTBE?
Mr. Williamson: This could impact the soil concentration and we have considered this.

Ms. Lattanzio: Has this concentration been lower and then increased? Is the plume moving north?
Mr. Williamson: The plume north of the Navy property is staying stable with the exception of the northeastern leading edge. There are wells in place to monitor this area.

Mr. Draeger: At what depth are these samples being collected? What is the likelihood that people will come into contact with this material?
Mr. Williamson: It varies. Wells are screened well within groundwater table. The minimum would be 16-18 feet below ground surface and the maximum would be 25 feet below ground surface. There is no possibility that people will come into contact with this material.

Mr. Johnston: Why can't people plant fruit trees?
Ms. McGarry: We did not restrict people planting fruit trees but it was an advisory. The Land Use Covenant stated this but did not make it a restriction.

Toxicologist (Patty Wong-Yim): There is no good information available regarding volatile compounds in fruit. As a precaution, there is this advisement but there is no real threat.

Mr. Williamson: To summarize the historic sampling – there is low to non-detect groundwater levels. The groundwater is moving to the north, not to the east. There is no risk to the school site; it is safe for students and adults based on the residential thresholds.

Follow up actions to the IJ story include the Navy preparing a fact sheet addressing concerns east of C Street. The fact sheet will be available sometime in February or March, and we will do a mailing as well as ensuring that the school district, city and the local press have a copy. A public forum has been planned that will be attended by the Navy regulatory agencies, representatives from the school district and the City of Novato. This forum will take place January 20th at 7:00 pm at the school district offices. The data collected for years indicates that the site is safe. Per the cleanup activities that the Navy has conducted since 1992, more than 95% of the estimated mass of gasoline constituents in soil around the old tank areas has been removed. The Navy has removed approximately 99% of estimated benzene in groundwater, and with the biosparging system, MTBE concentrations within the treatment area have decreased 74% within 15 months of operation. We will continue to monitor and the system will be shut off when the goals have been reached. The regulatory agencies, City of Novato, and the school

district agree that the day care center and charter school are safe based on the existing data.

Question- Why was that property given to the school by the Navy?
Ms. Valenzia: The Navy looks for governments, schools and cities to donate land to.
Mr. Sanders: The Navy transfers the land to the city and a reuse committee, who then determines an appropriate reuse plan for the property.

Question: Could the treatment plan help to reduce MTBE levels near Landfill 26?
Mr. McAlister: The treatment plan was designed specifically for groundwater and would not have an affect on the levels at the Landfill.

Ms. Pat Eklund (Novato City Mayor): When the base closure process began, we (the Reuse Committee) put together a plan in the early 1990s that identified this particular area for the school district. The school district had to work with the Department of Education in order to transfer the property and the city worked with many federal agencies.
Ms. McGarry: Prior to its transfer, the property has to go through an environmental evaluation process by the Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC). DTSC evaluated to see if property could be a school. I can make that background information available. The DTSC looks at the data on a regular basis with the Navy to monitor and ensure that there are no increased risks from the biosparging system.

Judy Arnold (Coordinator for Senator Burton): On behalf of Senator John Burton, I would like to thank the agencies for their hard work.

Ms. Ines: Do you just look at the data gathered by other groups, or do you gather data yourself?
Ms. McGarry: We don't collect any samples; we look at the samples already gathered by the Navy using protocols that are approved by the EPA and DTSC. They run the risk calculations themselves and then we run them independently.
Ms. Valenzia: The agencies are instrumental in selecting the sampling locations, the type of data that is collected from the samples as well as evaluating the data. They are involved in every step.

Mr. Ross Millerick: I am a member of the RAB and also serve on the Novato School Board. The public school relies on the experts, including RWQCB and DTSC. I hope that the information heard tonight is brought to the community, due to the negative backlash from the January 1st article.

Toxicologist (Patty Wong Yim): When we analyze the data, we look at whether there is migration of the chemicals through the groundwater into the soil and then if there is penetration into the ambient air as well as air within the house. I calculate the risks for indoor as well as outdoor exposure, and both of these risks are below the USEPA risk threshold. This is how we draw the conclusion that the school and the day care center are safe with the most recent data and model.

Ms. Lattanzio: Have you been sampling recently at Pacheco Creek and what are the levels of MTBE?
Mr. Williamson: This area has been sampled. The levels are very low, 100 ppb or less.

Question: What are the risks for children playing in the creek?
Toxicologist (Patty Wong Yim): They would have to splash the water and get it into their mouths. The chemicals can also penetrate the skin. If the children play in the water, there is a chance that they will be exposed to the MTBE through their respiratory system. We would have to study the data to estimate the risks involved in playing in the creek.

Landfill 26, GSA, and North Antenna Field - Jim McAlister, USACE Project Manager

Methane Monitoring Update

Mr. McAlister reported on the methane levels recorded since the buffer trench was installed. The site is monitored on a monthly basis. Mr. McAlister presented a graphic that showed contour lines representing concentration levels of methane throughout the landfill area. Mr. McAlister reviewed the methane levels in the soil gas since July 2001. Some of the methane is believed to be derived from natural sources (naturally degrading organics) and carbon dating indicates that some methane is in the 300-800 year old range. Landfill gas would be 60-70 years old. As of December 18, 2003, the landfill gas mitigation control trench that has been measuring methane though gas probes showed that the trench continues to be effective and decreases the levels of methane in the soils. In some parts of the trench, the methane levels are close to zero, mostly around 2 percent.

Mr. Johnston: Presently are there higher concentrations of methane around GNP30 than in other areas?
Mr. McAlister: Yes, there are higher concentration levels in that area but they are still very low. It is a naturally occurring situation so the Army does not feel there is any need for remedial action.

Question: Is it possible that any of toxic chemicals could piggyback on the methane as it escapes from the landfill?
Mr. McAlister: This was a concern so we conducted a risk assessment, collecting methane and VOC data. The VOCs detected were not related to the methane.

Question: Does the wind have an effect on exposure?
Mr. McAlister: The wind blows west-east towards the bay, although this might change on a day-to-day basis.

The USACE continues to monitor the methane on a monthly basis, on the south end of the landfill next to Hamilton Meadows. Based on the data collected, a buffer trench was installed. The purpose of the buffer trench is to separate the landfill from Hamilton Meadows. However, there is still persistent methane. The trench goes three feet into

groundwater or to bedrock, which ever was encountered first. The trench is filled with gravel and has vent pipes that are connected to a collection tube in the trench to vent methane to the ambient air. The Army also installed an impermeable barrier to prevent the methane from traveling linearly down the length of the trench. The entire length of the trench and collection tube has been installed between landfill and Hamilton meadow subdivision. The first 1,000 linear feet was installed in January 2002, while the remaining 600 feet was installed in July/August 2002. The contours have changed dramatically, with persistent methane present on the Shea property. Methane is also present at a monitoring point just south of the trench, GNP30, which has shown seasonal variation in methane levels.

Future Activities
Mr. McAlister addressed the upcoming activities for Landfill 26.

- Remedial Investigation Report – Regulatory review (currently out for review)
- Trench Completion Report – November 2003
- Landfill Comp. Monitoring – February 2004
- Monitoring of Risk Assessment Probes – Quarterly
- Monitoring of Trench – Quarterly
- Board Order Compliance- 2005-8

North Antenna Field

We have performed a remedial investigation on the North Antenna Field and the report went out to DTSC and the Water Board in March 2003. DTSC has submitted comments, which the Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) is incorporating. The Risk Assessment Work Plan was processed as an addendum to the Risk Assessment that the BRAC had done on the adjacent parcel. However, the agencies pointed out that they never accepted the BRAC Risk Assessment, so we had to go back and create a stand-alone Risk Assessment. The wetlands people don't anticipate being ready for the North Antenna Field until the 2009 timeframe.

Mr. McAlister reviewed the schedule for the North Antenna Field clean-up.

- Remedial Investigation – March 2003
- Risk Assessment Workplan to Agencies- March 2004
- Risk Assessment to Agencies- August 2004
- Feasibility Study to Agencies – December 2004
- Decision Document to Agencies – To follow Feasibility study
- Remedial Action- 2006-8

Question: What is the general nature of the issues at the North Antenna Field?
Mr. McAlister: There was a rifle and skeet range and the majority of the contamination is lead, VOCs and PNAs from clay pigeons (in bonding agents of clay pigeons). But the major issue is lead.

Ms. Lattanzio: Was there any remediation needed in this area?
Mr. McAlister: This was requested in a report by the regulatory agencies.

California State Coastal Conservancy (CSCC) Wetlands Project Update- Eric Polson, CSCC

The existing project was authorized by Congress in 1999, and includes the Hamilton airfield, which used to belong to the Army and was recently transferred to the Coastal Conservancy, and the State Lands Commission parcel which is owned by the state, but which is under the program that Jim McAlister just detailed. Eric Polson explained that the major goal is to increase the size of the property and adopt an additional 1,600 acres. The CSCC hopes to do this under the Water Resources Development Act of 2004.

There are three phases of the project, a tidal wetlands phase, seasonal wetland areas, and tidal wetlands on the state lands commission parcel. The first phase of the project will be the seasonal wetland areas. CSCC has just received the Hamilton airfield property and is trying to move the project into construction. The first step will be the demolition of 6 to buildings. There are also two buildings that will be demolished on the ball field parcel in the near future. The next phase will be placing test fill on the new Hamilton park levee, next to Outparcel A-4. This phase will help determine the wetlands design. There is also a soil management plan in development. There is testing being conducted for DDT and PAH. The Hamilton wetlands project has levels of DDT that are below human health risks but are above a risk to an aquatic receptor in the wetlands. Adjacent to the runway, there is PAH testing going on due to jet fuel runoff. DDT data should be ready in April and PAH data should be ready in May. The soil management plan should be released in spring 2004 for regulatory review.

The hydrology study on Novato Creek will be conducted in the near future. Novato Creek is a flood zone, and there is some concern that the proposed project will affect this. The study is being coordinated with interested parties.

Mr. Cook: How were the wetlands designed?
Mr. Polson: The tidal wetland areas were actual tidal wetlands at the turn of the century, including much of the Hamilton area, which was diked. Normal tidal wetland elevation is about 3 feet above sea level, while Hamilton air field is now five feet below sea level. The project's purpose is to recreate what existed at the turn of the century, which will involve bringing the surface to high tide levels. CSCC will do that by placing clean dredging material and then introduce tidal action through the breaches. As part of the design process CSCC looked at old maps and investigated the history of the area. CSCC will not alter the channels, but will make the breach and set the template and let nature design the channels.

Mr. Cook: Will dredging be necessary?
Mr. Polson: I don't think that we will be dredging the breach. Due to the velocities, it should be self cleaning, self scouring. In the mud flat there is potential for dredging which will be the subject of a further study during the site design. In the long run, there might need to be minimal dredging. If there was a blockage it could affect the quality of the habitat.

Question: Will any re-vegetation be done?
Mr. Polson: Natural re-vegetation is what is planned here. There are existing tidal marshes (nearby) that will provide the seed stock. There will be a 13 year monitoring and adaptive management period after breaching the levee. We will then correct anything that is not developing as it should. This is a particularly long monitoring period.

Ms. Dekelboum: What will be done to clean the channel out?
Mr. Polson: At low tide, there are mud flats, which are historical and a natural occurrence. No boats will need to navigate this area so no water will be needed at low tide.

Ms. Britto: What is being proposed for Pacheco Creek?
Mr. Polson: This is a part of the preferred alternative, which is revised alternative #2. There will be a 20 acre expansion of Pacheco Pond. There will be a public access trail around the creek. There will be a trail around the entire edge of the project, which will be a segment of the Bay Trail.

Ms. Lattanzio: A concern to the community is the breach to Novato Creek, which will significantly impact the hydrology of the creek. Another serious concern is the blocking off of flows from Pacheco Creek and Arroyo San Jose, which will create flows into Pacheco Pond, causing increased sedimentation of the creek. The creek needs to flow, not just for mitigation but also for environmental reasons and to protect the endangered species that are using it for habitat.
Mr. Polson: These issues will be addressed in the hydrology report and in the meeting on the January 23rd.

Ms. Dekelboum: Will there be a mosquito abatement plan?
Mr. Polson: Yes, this will be implemented.

Question: Will you be able to walk the outer levee?
Mr. Polson: No, the outer levee is endangered species habitat, and the regulatory resource agencies don't want people or predators to access this habitat.

Mr. Cook: What is dredge material that will be brought in?
Mr. Polson: The dredge material will come from various authorized dredging projects in the Bay Area. The current material scheduled to come to Hamilton is from the Port of Oakland project. Some of the sand, which hasn't been exposed since the last ice age, will be used to do the deeper fills in the seasonal wetland areas. We will receive about 1.8 million cubic yards of sand from them. This should start in June 2005. All of the dredge material that comes here needs to be suitable for wetlands cover criteria. These criteria are established by the Dredged Material Management Office (DMMO), which incorporates many of the regulatory agencies, and create a dredging and sampling plan. The office determines what the dredged material is suitable for. The material is dredged by a clamshell dredge and put into a barge, which comes into San Pablo Bay. The material is then transferred to a pipeline. CSCC will add water to the material when it is

pumped into the site. The material settles out and the water is tested for quality and then returned to the bay.

Mr. Cook: Is there any advisory committee or restoration board that will be formed?
Mr. Polson: There is a Hamilton restoration group (HRG) which, although it has not met recently, has been involved with various environmental agencies. Everyone in the environmental community is on board with this project, and as the project changes we will meet again.

Mr. Ashley: How will the State Lands property be accessed once the wetland is brought into the former BRAC property?
Mr. Polson: The access to these properties will always be through Nave Drive, Tunnel Road, and Aberdeen Road. There will also be access roads on top of berms and levees while the wetlands are being filled.

Army BRAC Update: Ed Keller, BRAC Environmental Coordinator (BEC)

Documentation and Next Steps

Documentation

Main Airfield Parcel:

- Levee Parcel Finding of Suitability for Transfer (FOST)- This document included the property beneath the existing levee. The public comment period was December 5, 2003 through January 9, 2004. A public comment meeting was held on January 6, 2004. Comments were received and responses are being prepared. The FOST document is scheduled to be sent for the Army signature by the end of January. The Army would be looking at transfer in the near future. The parcel is about 13.2 acres. The Hamilton partners were provided an easement to construct the levee. The levee itself is owned by the City of Novato, so the FOST specifies that the transfer is for the property beneath the levee structure.

- *POL Hill*-The Corrective Action Plan (CAP) was forwarded to the Water Board and DTSC for regulatory review. The closure report for remaining features was forwarded for regulatory review. The FOST went out for public comment from June 30, 2003 through July 30, 2003. Comments were received and the final document is almost ready to send to the Army for their legal review and signature. The parcel will not transfer immediately to the City of Novato, it will be held for some time because we are also working on the levee parcel and would like to transfer them at the same time. Everything that did not make it by September 30th, the Army thinks is ready to go early in fiscal year 2004, so the Corps is pushing to get it through.

There was a petroleum leak from a tank that has migrated into the fractured bedrock in the area of POL Hill. The area has been monitored since 1994 and the CAP recommends monitored natural attenuation as the solution. The Army samples yearly at this location.

All of the contaminated soils were removed down to the bedrock itself, thus making any more removal infeasible. Petroleum concentrations have fluctuated over time: concentrations are higher in the winter when groundwater elevations rise due to rainwater, and lower in the summer (August through September) before it starts to rain again. Recent data shows that the plume is not migrating.

Groundwater was also sampled in the area of the tank farm and was determined not to be impacted. The Army has prepared a closure report for all the remaining features on the parcel. That report has been submitted for regulatory review. The Army has talked to the Water Board and they have completed their preliminary review of the documents and they seem to support moving forward with transfer of the property as it does not seem to pose any risk to human health or the environment. The Finding of Suitability for Transfer was released for public comment on June 30, 2003. The comment period ended July 30, 2003. A public comment meeting was held on July 23, 2003 and no comments have been received at this time, although some are expected from the Water Board. The final document is ready for Army signature. The natural attenuation process will continue to be monitored until the land is transferred.

Field Work

Northwest Alleged Disposal Area (NWADA)- The Army collected 23 samples at 12 locations on November 18 and 19, 2003. The 24th sample was not taken because of refusal issues, i.e., the Army encountered bedrock at a shallow depth. The draft results are due at the beginning of April, and copies will be available to the public. Preliminary review of the data suggested that the alleged disposal activity did not occur. The Army has not found anything that would indicate dumping of petroleum, bleaches, radioactive commodities or other materials. This is the site that is referenced in a Marin IJ article.

Miscellaneous Sites Investigation- Samples are being collected this week. Final data report is due at the end of May.

Coastal Salt March Investigation- Sampling scheduled to begin next week through the end of January. Final data report due out in July.

Runway Soil Stockpiles- Sampling is complete. Final date report due out in mid March.

All of the documents will be available in the public library.

Ms. Sovlet: What is the purpose of leaving the soil on the runway?

The soil referred to is the Scottsdale Pond soil from a City of Novato project. The soil is currently piled on the city property.

Mr. Keller: A representative from the city would have to answer that question.

Property Transfer Status

Main Airfield Parcel- Transfer of the 630 acres to the State Coastal Conservancy for wetland restoration project is complete.

Hospital Hill- Transfer of 3.41 acres to the City of Novato for neighborhood commercial use is complete.

Outparcel A-4- Transfer of 3.96 acres to the developer for commercial use is complete.

POL Hill- Transfer of 5.67 acres of the City of Novato for open space is scheduled for spring of 2004.

Levee Parcel- Transfer of 13.21 acres to the City of Novato for levee footprint scheduled for the spring of 2004.

Next Steps
Main Airfield Parcel

- Complete sampling required by ROD/RAP;
- Prepare remedial design documents;
- Implement remedial investigations of a few sites:
    - Skeet range on the south end;
    - Firing range in the levee area; and
    - Disposal area in the north end of the airfield

Sampling will be done at all of these sites outlined in the ROD/RAP and remedies will be implemented after the point of transfer. We would like to get started on the outboard sites September of next year, while there is still good weather, but after the nesting season of the clapper rail. Our excavation window is September 1st-January 31st.

- *POL Hill* – The next steps are to sign the FOST and transfer the property. Long-term monitoring, required by the ROD/RAP will continue until the Water Board is satisfied that the property is stable and we can obtain final closeout of the site.

Mr. Johnston: What was the cost of performing the NWADA sampling?
Ms. Lanzaro: $75,000 for the sampling and $100,000 for previous archival work.

Question: Is it already transferred to the City of Novato?
Mr. Keller: There are approximately two acres along POL Hill that will be retained by the Army. The Army is required to retain the landfill and its buffer zone. The remaining 5.7 acres will be transferred to the City of Novato for open space and we expect this to happen in the spring of 2004.

Ms. Sovlet: Will other items in POL Hill be removed such as the fence and telephone poles?
Mr. Keller: BRAC cannot use funds for site improvements, unless features are required to be removed due to cleanup.

Regulatory Agencies comments

None were made.

Meeting wrap up and Adjournment- Tunstall Lang

Ms. Lang announced that the next meeting will be held on April 14, 2004